



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/917,913	07/31/2001	Hitoshi Ikeda	100353-00065	2024

7590

08/07/2003

ARENT FOX KINTNER PLOTKIN & KAHN, PLLC
SUITE 400
1050 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20036-5339

EXAMINER

YOHA, CONNIE C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2818

DATE MAILED: 08/07/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/917,913

Applicant(s)

IKEDA ET AL.

Examiner

Connie c. Yoha

Art Unit

2818

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 May 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 8, 10, 13 and 14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 8, 10, 13, 14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 31 July 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Examiner took notice of the remarks and amendments made by applicant filed on 5/12/03.
2. A non-final rejection is applied to the pending claims using previously cited and newly cited references.
3. In response to the argument regarding to the claim 8 and 13 limitation of the first power pad and the second power pad supplying to the SRAM and DRAM respectively. Examiner agreed with the applicant that the two power sources are separately provided for supplying power to the SRAM and the DRAM. However, examiner likes to state that in a general meaning, the first power pad and the second power pad does not equivalent to two separate external supply power sources. Therefore, in a broad interpretation, examiner interprets that Maesako does supply two separate power sources (fig. 82, one from vint and another from vext) or (fig. 83, vint1 and vint1) to the SRAM and the DRAM. These two power sources (vint1 and vint2) can be of different values; one is higher than the other (col. 34, line 1-8 discussed such concept). Maesako therefore, does disclose the claim limitation of the first power pad and the second power pad supplying the power source to the SRAM and DRAM respectively.

Response to Amendment

4. This office action is in response to Amendment filed on 5/12/03.
Claim 8, 10, and 13 are amended.
Claim 9 is canceled.

Claims 8, 10, and 13-14 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 8, 10, and 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maesako et al, Pat. No. 6016280 (previously cited) in view of Rose et al, Pat. No. 5471421.

With regard to claim 8 and 13, Maesako discloses a semiconductor memory device comprising: an SRAM memory block (fig. 82 or 83, 602) provided on a chip, the SRAM memory block including a first power pad and an SRAM cell array connected to the first power pad (fig. 82, from VEXT) or (fig. 83, VINT2); a DRAM memory block (fig. 82 or 83, 601) provided on the chip, the DRAM memory block including a second power pad and a DRAM cell array connected to the second power pad (fig. 82, VINT) or (fig. 83, VINT1). Maesako is silent in disclosing a control unit controlling ON/OFF of a source voltage supplied to the DRAM memory block via the second power pad, depending on whether the DRAM cell array is used to retain data, so that the source voltage supplied to the DRAM memory block is cut off when the DRAM cell array is not used. However, Rose discloses a control circuit (fig. 1, 16) controlling ON/OFF of a

source voltage (fig. 1, VDD) supplied to the DRAM memory cell depending on whether the DRAM cell is used (accessed) to retain data, so that the source voltage supplied to the DRAM memory cell is cut off when the DRAM cell is not used (not accessed) (col. 4, line 57-64) to controlling the power supply voltage to the DRAM. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the control circuit of Rose's into Maesako's in order to control the power supply to the DRAM for the purpose of saving power consumption when the DRAM is not in use (also with regard to claim 10 and 14).

Conclusion


6. When responding to the office action, Applicants' are advised to provide the examiner with the line numbers and page numbers in the application and/or references cited to assist the examiner to locate the appropriate paragraphs.

7. A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 (three) months and 0 (zero) day from the date of this letter. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned (see MPEP 710.02 (b)).

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to whose telephone number is (703) 306-5731. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. - Fri. from 8:00 A.M. to 5:30 PM. The examiner's supervisor, David Nelms, can be reached on (703) 308-4910. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 308-7722. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-0956.

Application/Control Number: 09/917,913
Art Unit: 2818

Page 5



C. Yoha

July 2003



Connie C. Yoha

Patent Examiner

Art Unit 2818